DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 160 685 UD 018 600

AUTHOR Passow, A. Harry
TITLE Redevelopment of Disadvantaged Youth: The U.S.A. Experience.
PUB DATE 13 Aug 78
NOTE 36p.; For a related document, see UD 018 601; Paper prepared for presentation at the Youth Aliyah and Hadassah Seminar on Residential Education and Disadvantaged Youth (Jerusalem, Israel, September 13, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education Programs; *Compensatory Education Programs; *Educationally Disadvantaged; *Educational Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Programs; Low Income Groups; Preschool Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; Job Corps; National Institute of Education; Project Follow Through; Project Head Start; Upward Bound

ABSTRACT

Since the early 1960s, there has been an outpouring of research and a mounting of programs and projects dealing with compensatory education for the disadvantaged. Despite continued debate over what constitutes compensatory education, many programs for the educationally disadvantaged share common characteristics. Three of the largest Federally sponsored programs--Head Start, Follow Through, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I, focus on early childhood education. Two Federally funded programs, Upward Bound and Job Corps, are specifically aimed at adolescents and young adults. Studies and surveys of these and other compensatory programs are being conducted by the National Institute of Education (NIE) because earlier evaluations, especially of Title I (ESEA), have proven to be unsatisfactory. The NIE study consists of 35 research projects which deal with areas of funds allocation, compensatory services, student development, and administration. Another NIE study is examining the effectiveness of reading and mathematics instruction provided for compensatory education students. The emphases of compensatory programs and the foci and conclusions of their evaluations are reviewed in this paper. (Author/EB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SEP 27 1978

ED160685

REDEVELOPMENT OF DISADVANTAGED YOUTH:

THE U.S.A. EXPERIENCE

A. Harry Passow

Jacob H. Schiff Professor of Education and Director,
Division of Educational Institutions and Programs
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Harry Passow

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prepared for Presentation at a Symposium at the
Youth Aliyah and Hadassah Seminar on "Residential
Education and Disadvantaged Youth" in
Jersualem, Israel, 13 September 1978

UD 018600

THE REDEVELOPMENT OF DISADVANTAGED YOUTH: THE U.S.A. EXPERIENCE

A. Harry Passow

Since the early 1960's, stimulated by a variety of educational, social, political, and economic factors, there has been an outpouring of research and a mounting of a vast array of programs and projects dealing with "compensatory education for the disadvantaged." As programs emerged, many with clever acronym titles, debate has continued around the underlying meaning and philosophy of compensatory education and the terminology used to describe the populations involved. What, for example is being compensated for? Compensation generally implies a deficit which must be overcome. Where is the "deficiency" located-- in the child, his home and family, his community, or his school? Is compensatory education basically remedial or is it only developmental in nature?

The issue of what constitutes compensatory instructional intervention also focuses on its basic nature. Should it provide disadvantaged children with more of what the middle-class child presumably is already receiving? Or, should it provide children from low-income, minority groups with qualitatively different educational experiences and environments? Can qualitatively different programs be provided within existing frameworks or are alternative educational environments needed? These controversies are not simply matters of semantic differences. The concept of compensatory

education is intertwined with concepts of quality education and of equality of educational opportunity and with the socio-political ideologies which underlie them.

Since the early 1960's, a variety of federal and state legislation has been enacted designed, as in the case of the Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), "to contribute particularly to meeting the educational needs of the educationally deprived children." Implementation of this legislation, with varied successes and failures, has generated controversy on the nature of these special educational needs, the causes of deprivation and disadvantage, and the means for achieving equality-- equality defined in various ways.

Compensatory instructional intervention programs, by necessity, contain implicit if not always explicit hypotheses or theoretical bases for such intervention or treatments. For example, if experiential differentials or deprivations in early childhood are believed to account for minority group youngsters entering classrooms unprepared to cope with the demands made by the school, then programs should be designed to compensate for such deficiencies. If limited language development is perceived as blocking transition from concrete to abstract modes of thought, the intervention programs should provide linguistic experiences to nurture such growth. If racial or socio-economic isolation has negative effects on academic achievement, then procedures should be designed to provide a different racial or socio-economic balance to overcome such isolation. Thus, there are a variety of concepts of what constitutes <u>compensatory instructional intervention</u>, and even as to what constitutes <u>instruction</u>. If one focuses on the elements of the instructional processes narrowly conceived, then only programs involved with

students and teachers engaged directly in learning and teaching would be considered compensatory. However, compensatory instructional intervention increasingly concerns the context, setting, and intervening variables affecting such instruction, either directly or indirectly. If instruction is broadly conceived, then parents are instructors just as are teachers in schools and personnel in a variety of non-school educating agencies.

Miller and Roby (1969) have suggested that the various strategies for improving educational performance of poor and minority group children generally fall into five categories (or combinations thereof): (1) changing the student and his family-- aiming at "'compensatory socialization' in which the deficiencies of the educational environment provided by low-income family life would be made up later"; (2) changing the school-- aiming at bringing about changes in the teachers, administrators, curriculum, materials, services, etc., rather than focusing on the deficiencies of the learners; (3) increasing resources and changing their distribution-- increasing the level of funding and also altering the integration; (4) changing the student composition-- providing for greater socioeconomic and racial balance; and (5) changing control of the schools-- decentralizing administrative arrangements for schools and providing for greater community control and involvement in decision-making. Miller and Roby argue that our limited understanding of how to bring about changes at the micro-level of education (e.g., teaching of reading or teachers' attitudes) results in efforts at altering education at the macro-level: "Hopefully, when we have accomplished change at the macro-level-- change in the organizational context, changes across urban-suburban lines in student composition, changes in the distribution of educational and economic resources, and the development

alternatives to education for economic self-improvement-- we will be able to function at the micro-level." (ibid., p. 29) However, it could also be argued that many so-called programs are simply projects at the micro-level with no basic conceptual model involved.

The many programs and projects for the educationally disadvantaged which together comprise what might be called "the U.S.A. experience" are diverse indeed. They can be characterized or catalogued in a variety of ways: (Passow, 1971, p. 18)

1. By target population (preschool, elementary, higher education, adult, teacher, etc.)
2. By nature of treatment (therapeutic, compensatory, remedial, enrichment, etc.)
3. By focus of activities (in school, family, community, industry, non-school agency, etc.)
4. By nature of services (instructional,counseling, community development, health, etc.)
5. By basic intent of strategy (reform of system, redistribution of power, integration, reallocation of resources, etc.)
6. By focus of diagnosis and prescriptive activities (learners, professionals, the education system, society, etc.)
7. By source of funding or legislation (Office of Education, Office of Economic Opportunity, state, non-governmental agency, foundation, etc.)

These catalog sets are not mutually exclusive, of course, and programs and projects fit into more than one set. Some efforts are very limited and restricted (e.g., a Head Start class for 15 four-year olds), while others are more global and comprehensive (e.g., an alternative high school or model school subsystem). Most school programs are additive--i.e., tagged on to existing programs rather than designed to provide fundamental changes. Some programs deal with personnel changes, some with organizational

changes, some with curriculum, and still others with affecting the relationships among various components of the educational enterprise-- formal and informal, school and non-school. (ibid., pp. 18-19)

In examining the programs and projects for the disadvantaged, it is difficult to determine whether the impetus for such programs came from the federal government-- through Head Start, Follow Through, ESEA Title I-- or from state and local educators and legislators. At least two states, California and Hawaii, initiated compensatory programs prior to passage of ESEA in 1965. However, most state programs followed Title I and were often modeled after federal programs.

A survey indicated that no two state-financed programs are exactly alike. Some states define disadvantaged as drop-outs or children from non-English speaking homes while others use economic and/or cultural criteria or achievement levels.

The more than 30,000 Title I projects across the nation reflect multiple goals and multiple treatments which are not readily converted into overarching objectives or program models. In fact, as has been pointed out, Title I is simply a federal funding program for the disadvantaged not an educational program. Although evaluation is an integral part of Title I, having been mandated in the original legislation, and while considerable evaluation has been undertaken, the consensus seems to be that Title I evaluation strategies have not provided the federal government with objective, reliable program outcome measures. As one report put it, "the mandated evaluation scheme has led to local evaluation that is typically seen as little more than an annual ritualistic

defense of program activities.... On balance, the experience of Title I evaluation indicates that the constituent units of Title I policy system are more impervious to information and to the intent of federal policies than reformers had expected." (Milbrey et al., 1974, p. vii)

The U.S. Office of Education's Division of Compensatory Education reviewed a number of studies which had been completed between 1970-1972 and identified eight "common characteristics of successful compensatory education programs." These included:

1. Systematic planning which begins with formal policy decisions to increase support for quality compensatory programs.

2. Clear objectives which must be clearly written and stated in specific measurable terms.

3. Intensity of treatment which includes the amount of time the child spends in the program and the staff/pupil ratio within the classroom. Here, USOE cited the wide variance in the number of instructional hours per week in the programs studied (from three-fourths of an hour per day twice weekly to seven hours a day, five days a week). Likewise, the staff/pupil ratio varied from 1:1 to 1:15.

4. Attention to individual needs which includes a careful diagnosis and an individualized plan for each student.

5. Flexibility in grouping which allows staff opportunities to provide small group instruction and to teach frequently on a one-to-one basis.

6. Personnel management which allows key staff personnel to work individually with teachers in the classroom.

7. Structured program approach which stresses sequential order and activities. Pupils must also receive frequent and immediate feedback.

8. Parental involvement which means the home must support what the child learns in school.

To speak of the U.S.A. experience with respect to the redevelopment of disadvantaged children and youth is to talk about a

considerable diversity and generalizations become somewhat difficult. One conclusion that is clear, however, is that the bulk of resources for compensatory education for the disadvantaged go to early childhood development. A study of Title I projects concluded that "students in grades 7-12 receive little attention from the giant federal compensatory education programs" with only a small proportion of the money being used to help students beyond the sixth grade. The study, aimed at determining what federal, state and local resources were being used to assist disadvantaged older students and how these programs differed from those designed primarily for younger children, examined basic skills programs for adolescents in seven states. The study found considerable variability in design, organization, and immediate objectives for the secondary school programs with many of the compensatory projects being "much more complex than the 'pull out' designs that are familiar in Title I and that dominate compensatory education projects at the elementary school level." (Larson et al., 1977, p. ix)

Despite the tremendous variability, five patterns related to the organization of projects were found. These included:

1. Support teacher design-- actual remediation is provided by a "support teacher" who is usually a specialist with an extra credential and/or previous clinical experience, who has been newly hired to provide this remediation, visiting classes or schools to work with students whom the regular teacher has identified.

2. Remedial class design-- instead of providing remedial instruction in regular English and mathematics classes, compensatory instruction is provided in special remedial classes for which a separate teacher is provided and a separate time scheduled.

3. Content area design-- represent and integration of remedial and regular services to the project pupils with the basic skills seen not as ends in themselves but because they are needed to perform other activities, skills basic to adequate performance in school tasks. Skills at stake are not so much decoding and phonics as comprehension, higher vocabulary, reference and study skills, and "critical" or "logical" thinking. Materials are drawn from many sources and takes place in a variety of designs.

4. Reading department design-- all students in the school take some sort of reading instruction, varying from letter recognition to "functional literacy" to speed and pleasure reading. Reading is a subject completely separate from English and language arts and every student takes both.

5, Alternative school design-- differs from previous four models in that while alternative schools offer special assistance in basic skills, they place much greater emphasis on counseling and vocational training and off-campus work experience than do regular schools. Based on the premise that students enrolled in alternative schools cannot relate adequately to the traditional structure, they provide numerous options and flexible arrangements. (ibid., pp. 121-137)

The study found no evidence of projects in which students were involved in designing the project, selecting the materials, or assessing the strengths or weaknesses of project operations-- despite the fact that such activities are well within the scope of adolescents' abilities and interests. Instead, it seemed to be universally accepted that "students-- particularly low achieving students-- are the passive and opinionless receptors of 'treatments' provided by project staffs." (ibid., p. 139)

Two federally sponsored programs which have been in operation for some time and involved hundreds of thousands of disadvantaged children are the Head Start and Follow Through programs. Head Start has been in operation since 1965; Follow Through was designed to build on the Head Start experiences and to influence change in elementary school programs.

Follow Through was originally conceived in 1967 as a large-scale program which would extend Head Start services through third grade. It has been called "the largest and most expensive federal educational experiment in this country's history." (House et al., 1978, p. 128) An anticipated appropriation of $ 120 million was cut to $ 15 million. The Office of Education converted the program into a planned variation experiment in which pupils enrolled in different models of early-childhood education are compared to each other and to pupils from non-Follow Through classes. The planned variation approach is aimed at increasing "knowledge of which kinds of educational programs would have different patterns of effects in various kinds of settings." (Kennedy, 1978, p. 3) Some 20 different models were implemented, each in a variety of settings with children exposed to their models from kindergarten through third grade. A report analyzing the third-grade outcomes on some 20,000 children involved in Follow Through as well as their parents and teachers was concluded in 1977. (Abt Associates, 1977)

In the Follow Through study, the effects of 13 different models were compared on standardized achievement tests of reading, language, and mathematics (Metropolitan Achievement Test); nonverbal problem-solving ability (Raven's Coloured Progressive Matrices); self-esteem (Coopersmith's Self-Esteem Inventory); and children's tendency to assign responsibility for their academic success or failure to their own efforts rather than external agents or conditions(Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Scale). The various Follow Through models were divided into three categories:

1. Basic skills-- models which focused first on elementary skills of vocabulary, arithmetic computation, spelling and language.

2. Cognitive-conceptual-- models which emphasize the more complex "learning-to-learn" and problem solving skills.

3. Affective-cognitive-- models which focus primarily on self-concept and attitudes toward learning, and secondarily on "learning-to-learn" skills. (House et al., 1978, p. 134)

The findings are, as could be expected, complex and often contradictory. Three findings were as follows:

1. The two models with at least one sizeable positive effect were both structured classroom approaches, while the three with sizeable negative effects were relatively unstructured approaches. However, all five models showing sizeable effects did so on only one or two outcome measures; their other effects were closer to null.

2. Most average effects were near zero.

3. The standard deviations of project effects were not constant across models or outcome measures. The cognitive-conceptual and affective-cognitive models tended to have larger variability among project effects, and their effects on some outcomes were much more variable across projects than on others. (Kennedy, 1978, p. 5)

An Office of Education researcher observed that the first finding tended to fuel the current debate over whether classrooms should be open or structured but felt that the generality of this finding had to be qualified by other findings: "that sizeable effects do not appear on all outcome measures, that both structured and open models appear in the category of models with null effects, and that variability of project effect was found within both structured and open classroom models." (ibid., p. 6)

On the basis of this report, the President of the United States has reportedly been advised that the results "are not positive enough to justify continued preferential treatment." (Hodges, 1978, p. 186) Hodges argues that such a judgment is wrong "and if it continues to prevail, the American public will be deprived of the benefits of the $600

million it has spent on finding out how to better educate disadvantaged children.". (ibid.) He suggests that the negative conclusion regarding Follow Through results from serious sampling, methodological, and design problems. Had results from data not reported but available been used, Hodges suggests they would have shown:

> that there have been encouraging results in reading and math, that overall the results are in keeping with model goals, that parental involvement was significant, that comprehensive models for primary education were developed, disseminated, and implemented effectively, and that school morale and teaching improved. Further examination of the already published Follow Through data and the data remaining at local sites with model sponsors is bound to reveal still more that will be of value in the areas of curriculum, school administration, teacher training, parent involvement, program implementation and evaluation, and teaching and learning at home and at school. (ibid., p. 191)

Hodges concludes that just "because Follow Through has not proved to be an easy, workable, inexpensive solution for all the educational problems of poor children does not mean that it should be dismissed as just another failure in compensatory education." (ibid.)

Two Programs for Adolescents and Young Adults: Upward Bound and Job Corps

Two federally funded programs have been in operation for more than a decade, programs specifically aimed at adolescents and young adults. These programs are unique in that unlike most programs for the disadvantaged, Upward Bound and Job Corps both have a residential component. Upward Bound provides for residence, usually on a college or university campus, during a six- or eight-week summer session. Job Corps provides residential centers for most of its enrollees, the exception being a very few experimental urban programs.

Upward Bound (UB) is a federally funded program "designed to reach low-income high school students who have potential for successfully completing a postsecondary program but who, due to inadequate preparation or lack of motivation, are prevented from seeking higher education or from meeting conventional criteria for admission to a college, university, or technical institute." (Pyecha and Berls, 1976) The program is designed to develop the skills and motivation needed to enter and successfully pursue postsecondary education through the use of remedial instruction, exposure to innovative curricula, tutoring, cultural exposure and counseling. Typically, UB students reside on a college, university or secondary school campus for an intensive six- to eight-week session during which they attend classes, participate in various cultural and social events, and receive counseling. During the academic year, they may attend Saturday classes, may participate in periodic tutorial/counseling sessions, and participate in occasional cultural enrichment and social activities. Students are provided a stipend of no more than $ 30.00 per month. Since 1972, the Federal government has provided for 100 percent funding with a maximum of $ 1,440 per student. During FY1973, 416 UB projects were in operation and served 27,900 students.

The UB program has three major objectives: (1) to increase the high school retention rates of its participants; (2) to increase the rate of entry of participants into postsecondary institutions; and (3) to generate the skills and motivation required for success in education beyond the high school. Evaluations of UB have brought mixed findings. A study by the Comptroller General of the United States (1974) which reviewed 15 projects in nine states concluded that:

> Although Upward Bound might be motivating students to enroll in college, OE [Office of Education] does not know how effective the program has been in achieving its goal of equipping students with the academic skills and motivation necessary for success in college. Available data indicates [sic] that the program apparently has not achieved this goal.

A much more comprehensive and better designed study was conducted by the Research Triangle Institute which focused on the 333 regular UB projects which operated in the coterminus United States during the 1973-74 program year. Eighty-three projects which operated outside the coterminus projects and/or classified as special veterans or demonstration porjects were excluded from the study. It concluded:

> The national impact findings are quite consistent in support of the central theme that for student outcomes relating to postsecondary school entry, there are strong positive relationships with UB participation; but for outcomes related to high school academic success or continuation no consistent relationships to UB participation exist. (Burkheimer, et al., 1976. p. 1)

> UB participants show greater motivation for PSE [postsecondary education] entry and for occupations requiring higher levels of education. They take more preliminary actions in preparation for PSE. They apply to and enter PSE institutions with greater relative frequency. They apply for financial aid in greater relative numbers and the aid packages which they are offered are more adequate. Although the PSE entry rate is greater for UB participants, this may be due more to higher application rate, since acceptance rates among those who apply is no greater for the UB group. (p. 20)

> These results cannot be attributed to differences between UB and CS [control students] on school-specific factors, academic risk status, poverty status, race, or sex, since these factors were controlled either in the study design or statistically through balancing procedures. (p. 21)

> The results of the analyses of project variation resist a simple interpretation, but a general theme is reflected throughout: project level outcome show relatively consistent and strong relationships to the measured input characteristics of the students in the project; however, they show, at best, weak relationships with project process measures when adjustments for input measure differences are made.(p. 23)

Thus, the findings related to differential program effectiveness do not indicate any systematic program treatments related to differential

project success. Instead, the relative success of individual projects appears more related to the characteristics of students who were recruited than to any functional or structural characteristics of the projects. In fact, the GAO (General Accounting Office) review of Upward Bound suggests that "many of the participants, particularly in the early years of the program, may have been acedemically able youngsters who did not need the program rather than underachievers who would not have gone on to college without Upward Bound." (p. 12)

A number of colleges and universities, intent on increasing minority group and disadvantaged representation on their campuses have operated their own "pre-freshman" summer residential programs which provide remediation, tutoring, and counseling very much like the Upward Bound programs but without Federal financial support. Evaluations of these summer residential programs on college and university campuses are scarce and their continuation may be as much political as educational.

One of the few other residential programs for disadvantaged youth is the federally supported Job Corps. The Job Corps was one component of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 designed to prepare "young people for a life of work." It provides remedial education, training in job skills, and counseling services to disadvantaged youths aged 16 to 21 who presumably "require a change in environment to become productive and employable." The training can take up to twenty-four months. Although there are a few urban commuter facilities, most of the Job Corps centers are residential facilities operated by private corporations, state or federal agencies, universities or nonprofit organizations.

Job Corpsmen/persons (enrollees are of both sexes) must have either dropped out of school or demonstrated an inability to benefit from

continuing in a regular school, must need vocational training in order to get and hold a decent job, come from a low income family, have both the mental ability and physical health to profit from the program, express a firm interest in joining the Job Corps, and have no history of criminal or antisocial behavior.

The average Job Corpsmember can be described as follows:

60 percent are black and approximately 11 percent Spanish speaking.
73 percent are young men, 27 percent are women.
80 percent are from urban areas, where social problems are concentrated.
69 percent, upon entry into the Job Corps, score below sixth grade reading level.
89 percent are school dropouts.
63 percent are from families of five or more persons
81 percent are from families whose annual incomes are $ 4,999 or less.
(U.S. Department of Labor, 1975)

The Job Corps has developed a variety of facilities to provide needed flexibility, including:

Civilian Conservation Centers-- operated either by the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior in the national parks or other public lands. These centers concentrate on teaching such skills as construction trades or heavy equipment operation. They average 180 enrollees.

Regional Centers-- These centers are operated under contract by business firms (e.g., Philco, RCA, etc.) or a state educational foundation for 200 to 2,200 enrollees. A wide variety of skills are taught.

Local Job Corps Centers-- These centers are designed to train from 125 to 350 enrollees from a single state or locality. These centers are operated by either private industry or nonprofit organizations, are located in or near metropolitcan areas, and provide training for jobs needed in that immediate area.

Job Corps Centers are residential centers where enrollees

receive comprehensive medical, dental, mental health, and other health-related services. They are housed in comfortable quarters which they must maintain, and are provided with nutritious meals. Corpsmembers receive work and dress clothing plus a monthly allowance of $ 30 which is raised to $ 50 if performance reaches expectations. A "readjustment allowance" of $ 50 per month of service is paid when the individual has either completed Job Corps training or performed satisfactorily for six months.

The Job Corps program combines work-skill training, on-the-job work experience, remedial education, and, if needed, social redirection. The Job Corps general education program consists of "reading, mathematics, language and study skills, consumer education, advanced general education, Standard English, English as a second language, home and family living, health education, and orientation to the world of work," leading to a High School General Education Development (GED) diploma if the American Council on Education's test is passed. About 4,000 Corpsmembers per year receive GED diplomas.

The vocational training program aims at preparing young men and women for specific jobs with known manpower shortages such as automotive and machinery repair, construction and metal trades, heavy equipment operation and transportation, cosmetology, business and clerical skills, health occupations. In some centers, preapprenticeship training is provided (e.g., construction trades and heavy equipment industries) by labor unions. Where appropriate, the centers are bilingual. Some Corpsmembers are helped to enter college.

Job placement is an important aspect of the program. A 1975 report indicates "that more than 93 percent of graduates available

for placement during the past year got jobs, returned to school, or went into the Armed Forces. Of the remainder, some were looking for better jobs, others were not yet employed because they were too young to meet age requirements for certain jobs, and some of the young women had married and were no longer in the labor force."

In 1969, the Job Corps was transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the U. S. Department of Labor. In a report issued by the Department on the tenth anniversary, it was observed:

> In its desire to accomplish much, it has dared much, failed sometimes, created controversy, and earned both accolades and criticism. What is certain is that it has added incalculably to the art of motivating and training alienated young men and women, and that it has touched the lives of hundred of thousands of young people and guided them into the mainstream of American life.

Evaluative research on Job Corps is difficult to find. As part of its required review of Title IV of CETA (Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973), a study has been undertaken to assess the non-economic outcomes of the Job Corps program such as "responsible habits of health and nutrition, educational achievement, social attitudes, job satisfaction, self-confidence, etc.) and to apply these measures in order to determine what effect the Job Corps experience has had on the enrollee."

Meade has noted that, in effect, the Jobs Corps represents an expenditure of "millions of dollars trying to undo what has been done wrong by schools." Writing a few years after the Corps was established, he pointed out

> that if the Job Corps succeeds, not only will it rehabilitate many youngsters who have heretofore had limited opportunities, but also will represent an indictment against what the schools now do for disadvantaged youth. If the Job Corps can succeed with youngsters who have been turned out by the schools, what does this say for the traditional school program and its relevance to this kind of youngster? (Meade, 1968, p. 252)

National Institute of Education Compensatory Education Study

The Education Amendments of 1974 (Public Law 93-380) instructed the National Institute of Education (NIE) "to conduct a study of compensatory education, including compensatory programs financed by States and those financed under the authority of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)." (NIE Compensatory Education Study, 1976, p. 11) The law also directed various Federal agencies to conduct studies and surveys which would provide Congress with more up-to-date and accurate information which it might use for its future consideration of legislation to assist elementary and secondary education.

Specifically, this section of the law requires the NIE to conduct a study of compensatory education which includes:

(1) An examination of the fundamental purposes of such programs, and the effectiveness of such programs in attaining such purposes;

(2) An analysis of means to identify accurately the children who have greatest need for such programs, in keeping with the fundamental purposes thereof;

(3) An analysis of the effectiveness of methods and procedures for meeting the educational needs of children, including the use of individualized written educational plans for children, and programs for training the teachers of children;

(4) An exploration of alternative methods, including use of procedures to assess educational disadvantage, for distributing funds under such programs to States, to State Educational agencies, and to Local Educational Agencies, in an equitable and efficient manner, which will accurately reflect conditions and insure that such funds reach the areas of greatest current need and are effectively used for such areas.

(5) Not more than 20 experimental programs, which shall be reasonably geographically representative, to be administered by the Institute, in cases where the Institute determines that such experimental programs are necessary to carry out the purposes of clauses (1) through (4).... (pp. 1-1, 1-2)

The law requires several interim reports with a final report due in September 1978. Consequently, as of this writing, the final report is still in the process of preparation and the findings which will guide Congress in its future legislation are not yet available. Clearly, in requesting a study of compensatory education, Congress was dissatisfied with the many earlier evaluations of Title I ESEA, an act which provides $ 2 billion, "most of which was used to improve educational programs for low-achieving students in school districts serving children from low-income families." (p. 1-1)

The impetus for the study came, in part, from several proposals for legislative changes, each of which would have had a major impact on the nature of Title I ESEA-- by far the largest of the compensatory education programs. For instance, one proposal was that allocations be based on the number of students achieving poorly in reading and mathematics rather than on the number of low-income students. Another proposal would have provided greater discretion to the States in determining how to spend the funds it received under a revenue sharing plan rather than a categorical approach. In the end, Congress decided to continue allocating Title I funds on the basis of numbers of low-income children until the study was completed. Until 1974, Title I allocations were based on the number of children in families with annual incomes below $ 2,000 and in families receiving more than $ 2,000 in assistance from Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).

Earlier evaluations of compensatory programs, especially of Title I ESEA, had proved unsatisfactory. A House of Representative report on the Education Amendments of 1974 noted:

> ... there are a few evaluation reports which show scientifically the success of Title I on a national level; but that failure is not so much a failure of the program as it is a failure to understand the nature of the program... Title I provides direct aid to school districts to use as they see fit to improve the education of educationally deprived children. Many school districts, in exercising this local decision-making, have felt that it is more important to use substantial amounts of money to meet health and nutritional needs of their students than to concentrate solely on remedial reading and mathematics. Therefore, to judge those programs according to the sole criterion of reading achievement is an invalid evaluation of their effectiveness. (pp. 1-4, 1-5)

The law required the NIE "to assess the current effectiveness of compensatory education programs in meeting their fundamental purposes" and to examine "alternative methods by which the effectiveness of compensatory programs might be improved." The Institute determined that there were three fundamental purposes of Title I ESEA:

> To provide financial assistance to school districts in relation to their numbers of low-income children and, within those school districts, to schools with the greatest numbers of low-income students
>
> To fund special services for low-achieving children in the poorest schools
>
> To contribute to the cognitive, emotional, social, or physical development of participating students. (pp. 1-7 to 1-10)

In connection with the NIE Compensatory Education Study, the American Institutes for Research was awarded a contract to produce a summary and synthesis of the substantive and methodological results of prior federal evaluations of compensatory education. Three documents were produced by AIR: Summaries of Federal Studies of Compensatory Education (Rossi et al., 1977), A Synthesis of the Findings of Federal Studies (McLaughlin, 1977), and Controversies in the Evaluation of Compensatory Education (McLaughlin et al., 1977). A search of ERIC for items dealing with "compensatory education" or "Title I" for the period 1966-1976

turned up 1,754 reports, many of which dealt with local evaluations. These studies focused on the fifteen major Title I evaluations conducted during that decade, providing "information sources concerning both the process and the effectiveness of Title I program management and project operation since the passage of " ESEA of 1965. (Rossi et al., 1977, p. 1) The types of information provided by the major Title I evaluations included: funding, participant characteristics, project characteristics, program impact, program management, and effective classroom techniques. Not all projects collected data in all six categories of information.

The synthesis of the findings of federal studies is presented with the caveat: "there are severe limitations on the validity of conclusions that can be reached using politically and economically feasible and available evaluation methods. Therefore, all results should be viewed as estimates awaiting verification." (McLaughlin, 1977, p. 83) The results are presented as they relate to three major tasks of Title I: participant selection, treatment delivery, and evaluation reporting. Program effectiveness results are then reviewed in terms of overall effectiveness, variation in effectiveness as a function of treatment method, and variation in effectiveness by types of participants. Some of the results follow:

1. Participant selection. There appears to be no question that Title I participants tended to be educationally and economically disadvantaged although not all children with educational and economic disadvantages have participated in Title I programs. There appeared to be no evidence that selection for compensatory education was being made on any grounds other than economic or educational disadvantage-- all other observed correlates of participation appeared to be correlates of need as well. Title I, while a major source of compensatory education assistance is but one of several sources, formal or informal, of support. (McLaughlin, 1977, pp. 13-36)

2. Treatment delivery. Local school districts have the responsibility of choosing strategies for using Title I funds which they deem best for meeting the special educational needs of educationally dis-

advantaged students in poverty areas. They may, on the basis of needs assessment, decide to focus on a single objective (e.g., improvement of reading achievement) or a broader range of goals. They may choose to implement a variety of treatments (e.g., buying curriculum packages, hiring a reading specialist or teacher aides). Treatments can be characterized as combinations of the following:

a. Functions-- e.g., increasing cognitive abilities, increasing the rate of achievement, improving the self/ideal image, and improving attitudes toward school work.

b. Agents-- e.g. (regular) teachers, teaching aides, parents, paraprofessional tutors, peer tutors, peer models, reading specialists, speech therapists, counselors, social workers, and computers.

c. Subjects-- e.g., primarily reading, language arts, and mathematics, but also natural sciences, social studies, cultural enrichment, and other non-basic skill areas.

d. Environments-- e.g., (regular) classroom, "laboratory", library, special classroom, home, field trips, college campus; child centered, structured, open, small groups, and individual interactions.

e. Activities-- e.g., (regular lessons, kits of special lessons, audio visual experiences, games and toys, dramatics, paying children to learn, parent training, busing, tutoring, and counseling.

f. Other services-- e.g. health, food, and clothing account for a small and decreasing percentage of Title I effort.

Although the methods have varied, the primary focuses of Title I projects have been directly on improving reading and language skills in primary grades. (ibid, pp. 37-47)

3. Evaluation Reporting. Annual evaluation reports are required to provide continuing checks that the funds from Title I were being used to help children. In its FY annual report, the Office of Education stated that "the evidence is now mixed whereas in prior times the only evidence available indicated that disadvantaged students had not improved or fell further behind." Some reports have indeed indicated the existence of positive effects and others negative, and nearly every report acknowledged the existence of severe problems in acquiring interpretable data sufficient to answer the question. No studies have been completed that provide an unequivocal answer to the question of how much effect Title I has had on achievement.

Although little is known about the differential effectiveness of compensatory education for different types of children, such information would contribute to improving the effectiveness of compensatory education programs by focusing allocations of particular resources where they would be most effective. It would also help to improve the validity of evaluations and to identify the most critically needed research and development. (ibid., pp. 49-73)

4. The major problems for Title I, some of which are now apparently solved but others of which continue, include misuse of funds, lack of consistent federal regulations and guidelines, invalid evaluations, lack of parental involvement, lack of effective treatment methods, lack of a strategy for developing effective treatment methods, lack of knowledge about individual differences in the processes by which children acquire cognitive skills, and the exclusion of disadvantaged children not in low-income areas. (ibid., p. 85)

The NIE study consists of 35 research projects which deal with the areas of funds allocation, compensatory services, student development, and administration with major research questions addressed in each of these four areas.

The principal findings from the first report in December 1976 were as follows:

1. The scope of compensatory education:

   Title I represented 3% of the total national expenditures for public elementary and secondary education; and State compensatory education programs, 1%. Ninety percent of the Nation's school districts received Title I funds.

   An average of 90% of the schools classified by LEAs as eligible receive Title I funds.

   An average of 57% of the children classified by LEAs as eligible participate in Title I programs.

   Approximately 5.9 million public school students in grades K-6 receive Title I or State-funded compensatory education services. This is 19.5% of all public school children enrolled in those grades.

An estimated 116,218 nonpublic school students or approximately 5% of the total enrollment in nonpublic schools rceive Title I-funded compensatory services.

Of all public elementary school teachers in 1975-76, an estimated 111,087, or 9.5% of the total, were involved for some portion of their time in providing compensatory education instruction.

According to data from district applications, Title I funds paid salaries of an estimated 8% of the elementary school teachers in these districts.

Title I funds paid the salaries of an estimated 54% of all teachers' aides in Title I districts.

2. The range of services provided with Title I funds:

The national average of the Title I budget spent on instructional services is 76%. However, when districts are classified by economic status (average family income), lower income districts spend 20% less of their Title I budget than wealthier districts on instructional services.

National average share of the Title I instructional budget spent on reading is 53%.

The national average share of the Title I instructional budget spent on mathematics is 19%.

The national average share of the Title I instructional budget spent on language arts is 10%.

The budgeted national average Title I expenditure per pupil participating in the program is $ 347. For instructional services, the budgeted national average Title I expenditure per participant is $ 263.

Some instructional services are provided by 98% of the districts; some support services are offered by 59%, with a large percentage of Title I districts funding more than one compensatory service.

69% of Title I districts use Title I funds for reading.

45% of Title I districts use Title I funds for mathematics.

38% use Title I funds to support preschool/kindergarten readiness programs.

30% provide instruction in language arts.

28% provide resource centers, and 21% support libraries.

20% provide medical and dental services.

3. The characteristics of students receiving services:

54% of compensatory education students are White, compared to 75% of the total enrollment.

34% of compensatory education students are Black, compared to 19% of total enrollment.

10% of compensatory education students are Spanish surnamed, compared to 5% of total enrollment.

Not all compensatory services are delivered to all compensatory education students. Estimates are that:
50% receive compensatory instruction in reading.
44% receive compensatory instruction in mathematics.
35% receive compensatory instruction in language arts.
14% receive compensatory instruction in social/cultural studies.
12% receive compensatory instruction in science.
5% receive compensatory instruction in special education/learning disabilities.
3% receive compensatory instruction in English as a second language.

4. The characteristics of compensatory instruction:

Many compensatory education students receive instruction in more than one subject matter.

The average amount of time spent in compensatory instruction is 5½ hours per week-- an average of 25% of total time available for learning.

85% of compensatory education students in reading, 66% of those in mathematics, and 63% of those in language arts programs receive this instruction outside their regular classrooms.

The average class size in which compensatory students receive instruction is 9 students for reading and 14 students in language arts and mathematics.

The amount of time spent in compensatory education classes is approximately 4 hours per week for reading and language arts, and 3 hours per week for mathematics. (pp. xv-xx)

In a report on compensatory education services which followed some months later, some additional data were provided from a cross-section

of the 14,000 districts receiving ESEA Title I funds. These included the following:

Title I services go primarily to elementary school students with 20% of the elementary school students in Title I districts receiving compensatory services. Less than 1% of the secondary school students in elementary and secondary Title I districts receive Title I services. Fewer than 4% of private school students receive Title I services; only 43% of the Title I districts that contain private schools provide such services to private school students.

School districts exercise considerable flexibility in identifying students to receive Title I services. All districts serve students judged to be educationally disadvantaged but their standards and ways of measuring need vary. Though all districts make some use of objective achievement tests, these examinations often cover only one grade. Thus, many students are selected to receive Title I services on the basis of teacher judgment, family income, or other criteria. Districts can establish their own criteria to establish Title I eligibility, so a student who would be eligible for compensatory education in one district may be ineligible in another.

Because of limitations in Title I funding, few districts can serve all of the students judged to be in need. Nationwide, approximately two-thirds of the students considered eligible according to district criteria are actually served. Some States complement Title I funding by their own compensatory education programs, and school districts in these States are often able to serve all of the needy students in their Title I schools.

The quality of compensatory instructional services is reflected in the four factors of class size, time spent in instruction, teacher characteristics, and individualization.

Professional teachers who deliver compensatory instruction are often highly qualified: 67% have graduate training beyond a bachelor's degree, and 62% specialize in teaching one subject. Teacher aides deliver a substantial portion of compensatory instruction. More than half the aides employed nationwide are paid from Title I funds.

Many school districts attempt to individualize their instruction, although few districts offer instruction that could be considered individualized in all respects.

Pullout instruction removes compensatory education students, at least temporarily, from the company of classmates who do not receive compensatory services. While most compensatory students belong to "mixed" homerooms, 24% of these students receive all of their instruction in groups composed entirely of students who receive compensatory services.

Variations among school districts in their compensatory instructional programs are strongly related to the size of the districts' Title I grants and to the staffing patterns they select. As Title I expenditures increase, districts serve more students in all areas of compensatory instruction and also rely more heavily on pullout programs.

District differences in selecting compensatory education teachers are also strongly related to the quantity of compensatory services they provide in different instructional areas. For example, districts which hire relatively large numbers of aides and teachers with master's degrees emphasize participation in pullout reading programs.

Title I instructional services appear to make a distinct contribution to the learning experiences of students. NIE obtained data on the reading and language arts instruction received by Title I and non-Title I students in 12 districts. Title I students in every district received extra services-- either in instruction, smaller group size, or more time with highly qualified teachers.

In contrast to the strong emphasis on compensatory education, auxiliary services represent a very small part of the overall Title I effort. Nationally, an average of 4% of the Title I budget was spent on auxiliary services and only a few districts devote more than 10% of their Title I budgets to such services. Parent involvement activities, including parent advisory councils, now account for the largest expenditures for auxiliary services. These expenditures have increased in recent years, while spending for libraries, health services, counseling, transportation, and overall auxiliary services has fallen. (NIE, 1977a, pp. vi-ix)

Another NIE study examined the effectiveness of reading and mathematics instruction provided compensatory education students, looking specifically at pullout vs. mainstream instruction, individualized instruction, and the importance of the content and intensity of instruction as these were operating in selected school systems. The findings were more positive than anticipated on the basis of past studies.

In general, the study's results were positive about the effectiveness of compensatory instructional programs. First graders in the sample made average gains of 12 months in reading and 11 months in mathematics in the 7-month period between fall and spring testing. Third graders gained 8 months in reading and 12-months in mathematics. Other measures, such as percentile gains, were similarly positive. The gains observed in the sample exceed those reported in the most encouraging recent evaluations of compensatory instruction. (NIE, 1977b, p. v)

First graders gained most when they received compensatory instruction in their regular classrooms. For third graders, the results were mixed: gains in reading were equal in both regular classroom and pullout programs while gains in mathematics were greatest in pullout settings. Given the fact that the NIE study showed that pullout instruction is provided to 64% of the students in reading and 28% in mathematics, these findings suggested a careful review of the benefits as well as the disadvantages of first grade pullout instruction.

The Instructional Dimensions Study (IDS) examined the effectiveness of individualized instruction in compensatory education, noting the problem in interpreting research results due to the variety of ways the term is used, including "teaching arrangements such as tutoring and independent study; certain instructional techniques, such as individual diagnosis and pacing; and kinds of classroom organization, such as small class size or open spaces that facilitate, but do not guarantee, individualization." (NIE, 1977b, p. 10) The IDS working definition of individualization included: "specific learning objectives assigned to individual children, small group or individual pacing, individual diagnosis and prescription, and alternative learning paths and sequencing for individual children." (NIE, 1977b, p. 11) The study found that while students in so-called individualized instruction programs did make substantial gains in achievement, in general their gains were no higher than those made by students in less individualized classrooms. Thus, using the IDS definition, individualization appears to be effective but not uniquely so. The report concluded that: "A more detailed analysis will be necessary to determine whether the concept of individualization should be redefined for

further research, or whether some concept other than individualization is more promising. (ibid, pp. y-yi) The study also found that student achievement gains were clearly related to the content and intensity of instruction provided-- "when instruction emphasized the exact skills on which achievement gains were measured, students' gains were especially large. The amount of time spent in instruction was particularly important for students in pullout programs." (ibid, p. vi)

Four other preliminary reports have been issued by the NIE Compensatory Education Study, dealing with aspects of education of the disadvantaged than those of direct concern here. They include:

1. Demonstration Studies of Funds Allocation within District.--Thirteen school districts received permission to use novel funds allocation procedures in their Title I programs with the results providing evidence about the practical consequences of the choice between poverty and achievement for allocating funds to schools. Most of the districts used achievement eligibility criteria and altered (usually increased) the number of schools and students served, but reduced the intensity of services provided each child. (NIE, 1977c)
2. Using Achievement Test Scores to Allocate Title I Funds.-- This study identified testing issues which need to be resolved before achievement data can be used to allocate funds, examined the procedures and costs associated with obtaining such achievement data, and analyzed funding pattern changes which were likely to result were achievement data to be used instead of poverty data. (NIE, 1977d)
3. Administration of Compensatory Education-- This report examined the actions of the Federal and state governments in using Title I funds to provide special educational services to educationally

disadvantaged students in low-income areas. (NIE, 1977e)

4. Title I Funds Allocation: The Current Formula-- This report examines the effects of the existing Title I allocation formula on the distribution of funds and explores several alternative formulae. The report focused specifically on the extent to which one of the principal purposes of ESEA Title I was being met--i.e., whether Federal education funds were indeed being directed to school districts and schools serving low-income children--and determined that the formula seemed to accomplish the purposes intended by the framers of the statute. (NIE, 1977f)

In September 1978, the National Institute of Education should report directly to the President and to the Congress on its examination of compensatory education and to provide Congress with specific recommendations which will guide that body in its deliberations of the range of possible objectives, funding methods, administrative techniques, and educational programs for the nation's educationally disadvantaged population.

In Conclusion

The U.S.A. experience in the redevelopment of disadvantaged children and youth has been very mixed. Seven years ago, I wrote:

> Since then [1962], having spent billions of dollars on compensatory education, initiated thousands of projects (each with its own clever acronym title), completed hundreds of studies of uneven significance and even more disparate quality, entered numerous judicial decisions and rulings, experienced dozens of riots and disorders, and generated new agencies and educational institutions, the nation's urban schools continue to operate in a vortex of segregation, alienation, and declining achievement. (Passow, 1971, p. 1)

A recent report by Chase based on a review of "successful programs" described by thirty urban school districts led him to suggest

five encouraging developments:

1. Urban education has an inner vitality which is generating programs and strategies of great potential even in the midst of extremely adverse conditions. Despite well documented testimony on the low achievement in urban schools and recent statistics purporting to show the schools as the most dangerous place to be, we are discovering many administrators, teachers and other staff members who are demonstrating ability to arouse zest for learning in students from diverse backgrounds, including those whose histories have been marked by failure, loss of hope, and/or anti-social behavior.

2. There is a deepening concern for the needs not well served by traditional schooling. Fewer educators and board members now attribute low achievement to inherent disabilities, lack of effort, or poverty of parents; and more and more are revising upward their expectations for students formerly regarded as slow learners. Efforts to adapt the curriculum to students and to create motivation and conditions for effective learning are likewise increasing in a number of schools and programs.

3. An increasing number of community agencies and groups are joining with the schools to develop enriched environments for learning; and the gulf between school and society is being bridged in many new ways.

4. Innovative programs and alternatives are producing significant changes in the character of educational experiences provided at both elementary and secondary levels.

5. The conditions essential to the success of magnet schools and other options are beginning to be better understood; and progress is being made toward creation of the essential conditions. Systematic curriculum development and modification is proceeding with improved provisions for initial and continuing staff development. The need for better counseling to help students make wise choices is being recognized: and efforts are being made to adapt instructional materials, facilities, and technologies to student characteristics. (Chase, 1978, pp. 8-10)

Chase suggested that his discussion of encouraging developments, if taken without qualification, might be regarded as "an excessively optimistic view," but pointed out that he was "describing small beginning on an enormous task of educational reconstruction, which demands and deserves a much more effective mobilization and use of resources than has yet occurred." (ibid., p. 11)

Reflecting on our urban education efforts-- a euphemism for education of the disadvantaged-- in an invited paper for the 1977 American Educational Research Association meetings, I concluded as follows:

> This, I believe, is the new challenge to urban education and to urban educators-- to reaffirm our traditional commitment to education and the value of education; to develop and implement a concept of urban education which occurs in and beyond the confines of the institution we call "school"; not to be discouraged by our lack of minimal successes in developing adequate and appropriate education for urban populations but rather to build on the research, theory, and experience of the past fifteen years to create a master plan for urban education that will replace our patchwork of expedients. (Passow, 1977, p. 10)

Such a master plan, as the HEW Urban Education Task Force proposed,

> must concomitantly deal with causes and symptoms, must be conceived within a framework of over-all urban problem solving rather than education per se, and must encompass all educational levels, i.e., from early childhood through higher and adult education. Moreover, this plan must reflect a considerable expansion and enrichment of what constitutes "education." Within the educational plan, there must be stress placed on developing and implementing appropriate curricular designs, consumer participation, staff development programs for <u>all</u> concerned, supportive services, and evaluation. Finally, it must be interrelated with other facets of the larger urban problems, such as housing, employment, recreation, and health. (HEW Urban Education Task Force, 1970, p. 6)

This is what the U.S.A. experience has meant to those who are seriously concerned with the education of disadvantaged children and youth and their redevelopment.

References

Burkheimer, G. J., Jr.; Levinson, J. R.; and French, A.M." A National Study of the Upward Bound Program: Analysis, Major Findings, and Implications." Paper presented at the 1976 AERA Meeting in San Francisco, California. Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute, 23 April 1976.

Comptroller General of the United States. Problems of the Upward Bound Program in Preparing Disadvantaged Students for a Postsecondary Education. Washington, D.C.: Office of the Comptroller General of the United States, March 7, 1974.

HEW Urban Education Task Force. Urban Schools Crisis: The Problem and Solutions. Washington, D.C.: National School Public Relations Association, 1970.

Hodges, W. L., "The Worth of the Follow Through Experience," Harvard Educational Review, 48:186-192, May 1978.

House, E. R.; Glass, G. V.; McLean, L. D.; and Walker, D. F., "No Simple Answer: Critique of the Follow Through Evaluation," Harvard Educational Review, 48:128-160, May 1978.

Kennedy, M. M., "Findings from the Follow Through Planned Variation Study," Educational Researcher, 7: 3-11, June 1977.

Larson, M. A., Winslow, H. R., and Malgoire, M. A., Survey of Basic Skills Programs for Adolescents in Seven States. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International, July 1977.

Manpower Administration, U. S. Department of Labor. Leaving the Future Open-- Job Corps, The First Decade. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

McLaughlin, D. H.. Title I, 1965-1975: A Synthesis of the Findings of Federal Studies. Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research, July 1977.

McLaughlin, D.H., Gilmartin, K. J., and Rossi, R. J. Controversies in the Evaluation of Compensatory Education. Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes of Research, July 1977.

Meade, Edward J., Jr.. "Vocational and Technical Education for Disadvantaged Youth: A Critical Look," in Developing Programs for the Educationally Disadvantaged, edited by A. Harry Passow. New York: Teachers College Press, 1968. pp.245-257.

Miller, S. M. and Roby, P. "Educational Strategies and the Disadvantaged: An Overview," Paper presented at Seventh Annual Work Conference on Urban Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, June 1969.

National Institute of Education Compensatory Education Study. Evaluating Compensatory Education: An Interim Report on the NIE Compensatory Education Study. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, December 30, 1976.

_____, Administration of Compensatory Education. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, September 19, 1977. (1977e)

_____, Compensatory Education Services. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, July 31, 1977. (1977a)

_____, Demonstration Studies of Funds Allocation Within Districts. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, September 30, 1977. (1977c)

_____, The Effects of Services on Student Development. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, September 30, 1977. (1977b)

_____, Title I Funds Allocation: The Current Formula. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, September 30, 1977. (1977f)

_____, Using Achievement Test Scores to Allocate Title I Funds. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, September 30, 1977. (1977d)

Passow, A. H. editor. Urban Education in the 1970's. New York: Teachers College Press, 1971.

Passow, A. H. "Urban Education: The New Challenge," Educational Researcher, 6: 5-10 , October 1977.

Rossi, Robert J.; McLaughlin, D. H.; Campbell, E. A.; and Everett, B. E.. Summaries of Major Title I Evaluations, 1966-1976. Palo Alto, CA: American Institute for Research, July 1977.